



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_6390
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, attitude, and practices related to dengue among caretakers of elementary school children in Chanthaburi Province, Thailand
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract: 4th line of the results, i.e. (aOR) 2.0, 95% CI [61.28-3.31] – I think the value highlighted in yellow has a mistake, please verify (From the results section, you seem to have meant 1.28 and not 61.28). Line 53: what was the total number of schools selected through your selection technique? This information must be included in this section.	We have corrected this to read “2.0, 95% CI [1.28–3.31]”. We have inserted this statement in section 2.2. “A total of 21 schools were selected through this method”.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 47: ‘... pupils in grades 4 through 6 were eligible...’ I suggest you replaces a highlighted word with the word ‘to’ Lines 64 and 65: how many questionnaires were administered through research assistants? This information is critical since there are known differences between self-administered and researcher-administered questionnaires, in terms of data quality. Did investigators observe any discrepancies in data quality between data collected through self-administered and research assistant-administered questionnaires? This has implications on validity and reliability of data and collection process thereof. It is however noted that authors address some of these questions in the last two paragraphs of the discussion section. Table 1: Ideally, the Table provides categorised age groups, at least, the age ranges, i.e. minimum and maximum age should reflect somewhere. Actually, I later	We have replaced the word ‘through’ with ‘to’ Although we had research assistants were on standby to help in administering the questionnaires especially to illiterate caretakers, given the high literacy levels among respondents, all respondents who completed the questionnaires did so without the help of research assistants. We have added this sentence in the results “all respondents completed the questionnaires without the help of research assistants”. We agree with the reviewer. We have included age categories, n and %, in



SDI Review Form 1.6

	picked up that all the information I am asking about is included on Table 5. I would suggest that you bring such information forward under the characteristics of caretakers (but only 'n' and '%') and Table 5 can be retained as is, because it is cross-tabulating these characteristics against the use of repellents. Table 4: Rephrase 'When mosquito repellent is used' to 'When is mosquito repellent used'	Table 5. We have rephrased this statement
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The concept 'caretaker' needs to be defined for the purpose of this study, because this concept may mean different things depending on the context. On overall, the manuscript is well written	We have defined caretaker as follows "A caretaker was defined as a child's biological parent who was staying with the child. For children who were not staying with a parent, a caretaker was defined as a guardian who was staying with the child and had the responsibility of day-to-day care of the child."